PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Papers to be laid on the Table. Mr. Advani ..... *{Interrup tions)....*

SHRI MD. SALIM (West Bengal): Sir, I have a point to raise. Last time also, I raised it. Irrespective of Governments, it is a question of importance of Parliament according to the Constitution, according to the statutes. Now the Home Minister, Mr. Advani, is going to lay a paper about as Notification. If you refer to both the items I and II, you will find that the Notifications are dated 23rd May, 1998. The Constitutional provision is this: "If the Parliament is in session, within 15 days of the notification."; the Act, the statute, says, "within 30 days or within 15 days of the next session." In between, after May, we had a Session here, the extended Budget Session, the delayed Budget Session. That May Notification is coming now! Only yesterday, we had a Supplementary Paper saying the same day Notification, the finance Ministry's Notification, was going to be laid. The Government said, "in deference to the parliamentary practice." The Home Minister also told us the other day, when J raised this point, and on other occasions also, "in -deference to the parliamentary practice", he was coming to the House as soon as possible. The 23rd May Notification is being brought now. Both the Acts, the BSF Act, 1968 and the Arms Act, 1959, do not stipulate that he can skip a session and then come to lay the notification. And there is no reason given either. At least, the reasosss should have been given..

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, in these matters when the Ministry *f*ails to comply with it within the stipulated period, they give a statement explaining the reasons for delay. Why has the statement explaining the reasons for delay not come? In a number of cases, we have accepted it, if that statement conies.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): the delay statement should accompany.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS {SHRI L. K. ADVANI): Sir, a delay statement ought to have been there. I will certainly place it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyway, it is all right.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Sir, I crave your indulgence. Pending that, the hon. Minister should not be allowed to lay this on the Table of the House. Let the explanation come. There has to be some sensitivity,

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: Sir, I will certainly find out. Perhaps, the Secretary-General may advise me, but as far as I am aware, this is at the earliest that we have been able to present it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyway, as the hon. Minister said, he will give the clarification, let him lay it tomorrow or the day after.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: That is right. That is better.

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: Sir, I think, if you could kindly allow me to place it.. *..(Interruptions)....*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The reasons for delay is what is necessary.

SHRI L. K. ADVANI: "Sir, I am not sure—they may have a point; at the moment, I am not ready—whether it is obligatory for the Government to place it immediately or not; I will have to find out, I will have to refer to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Generally, it is given along with it....*(Interruptions)..:*. Generally, it is given along with it. You have been a Member of Parliament. But the Secretary-General says that it can also follow. If there has been a precedent, then, you can lay it on the Table and.... *{Interruptions)....*

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: What is the urgency of laying the Papers today?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right now. That is all over. If there is a precedent—I was told there is a pre cedent ..... (*Interruptions)....*